

MAY 5 1960

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

The Church and the South African Tragedy

Day by day the press records the rising tide of tension between the Negro population of South Africa and the Government, which has held them in a status as close to slavery as anything known in modern life.

What is happening has been predicted for a long time by those who knew the facts; and some have predicted that the tragic drama will move to a climax of catastrophe because the white minority has been so unjust and has piled up such a fund of resentment among its victims that it is caught in a vicious circle. If it relaxes it may be wiped out. History has many patterns, one of which the prophet Isaiah described: "Woe unto those who spoil and are not spoiled; when they cease to spoil they will be spoiled."

As Alan Paton wrote in these pages a year ago, "This is a fear-ridden society . . . have no doubt of that . . . what hope is there for it? . . . what hope for those three million of your fifteen million who are white? One must reply that if they are intent solely on preserving their dominant position, there is no hope at all." ("South Africa, 1959," May 11, 1959)

We have some hopes that the rising tide of world protest—the United Nations resolution, the unanimous condemnation passed by the British House of Commons, the private protests of indignant people, the boycott of South Africa by British musicians and sportsmen—will somehow stay the hand of the hysterical Government before it plunges to inevitable disaster. Our immediate concern, however, is with the churches in this tragic drama.

To speak of the churches means to elucidate the fact that the tension between the English and the governing Dutch whites partially accounts for the tension between whites and blacks. For the governing National Party which instituted *apartheid* is composed chiefly of Boer farmers with deep resentments and inferiority feelings against the English. The English churches—Roman Catholic, Anglican, Methodist, Congregational—have universally condemned *apartheid*, though the English community has obscured its witness by not objecting to more than the obviously inhumane aspects of segregation.

The most disturbing fact, however, is that the Dutch Reformed Church has been the chief bulwark of the National Party. Quite a few of its leaders, former Prime Minister Malan for instance, were former preachers in that church. Fortunately there is an increasing dissent from some of the more sensitive spirits within the church. But the situation is that a Christian church has, on the whole, used an obscurantist version of the Christian faith to elaborate policies as inhumane as those of the Nazis, who were supposed to derive their inhumanity from their paganism.

Recently the Archbishop of Johannesburg, Dr. Ambrose Reeves, fled the country to escape arrest. He has long been an outspoken critic of the Government's policies. What is more important is that the Archbishop of Capetown, Joost de Blank (born in Holland and trained in Britain), has called upon the World Council of Churches to expel the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa for its complicity with the Government's inhumanity.

Vol. XX, No. 7 May 2, 1960 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

It may be that the World Council does not have the authority to do this. But it had better do something drastic to express the conscience of its worldwide community. Surely it ought to be able to take action as rigorous as the unanimous decision of the House of Commons in condemning the South African policy. Otherwise the observing world will draw the conclusion that the church is impotent when concerned with the "weightier matters of the law," which is to say the law of love.

The "German Christians" were both inhumane and heretical. The African church is obscurantist and inhumane. If the churches should find it easier to condemn the former than the latter, it might prove that they are the "salt which has lost its savor."

R. N.

THE DANGERS OF RELIGIOUS SOLIDARITY

WE HAVE spoken out against the idea that Protestants should vote against a Roman Catholic candidate automatically because he is a Catholic. We now fear that the real danger is not so much that Protestants will decide that a Catholic candidate should be rejected but that there will develop a pattern of religious solidarity and bloc voting on both sides.

Catholic solidarity will quite naturally produce Protestant solidarity. There are few things that could happen in American politics that would be more disastrous than to have the two major parties in the North divided primarily along Catholic-Protestant lines. How this would affect the Southern Democrats would be difficult to say.

Before we become too worried about this prospect, however, it would be well to consider, as Arthur Krock has suggested, that in Wisconsin there were no issues dividing the candidates. Senators Humphrey and Kennedy previously differed on farm policy, but they no longer do. They differ more in temper and perhaps in the degree of personal involvement in the problems they discuss than in their convictions about policies. In contrast to the domestic policies of the Administration, both are liberal Democrats whose policies, if either of them were President, would take the country down a new road.

In view of the fact that there were no crucial issues to lead voters to choose either Humphrey or Kennedy, one can hardly blame Catholic Democrats for voting for Kennedy. However, a more important sign of voting according to religion

arises in those cases where Catholic Republicans entered the Democratic primaries to vote for Kennedy.

At this stage, it is important to keep some perspective on what is happening. Protestants who have so often raised the issue of a Catholic President can hardly blame Catholics for doing what they can to wipe away this final symbol of restricted opportunity in America. Similarly, Catholics should not ascribe to bigotry all Protestant questioning about the desirability of having a Catholic in the White House. There is some bigotry, and even more, as we have previously noted, there is ignorant fear based upon oversimplified views of the Roman Church and of the power of the Pope to control American life. (Indeed, in the West Virginia primary there is much evidence of a resurgence of primitive anti-Catholicism that is not merely a response to Catholic solidarity.)

Catholics, however, should not forget that their traditional position in regard to church and state and the basis of religious liberty is enough to frighten Protestants. Many Catholics hate to be reminded of Pius IX and the Syllabus of Errors, and this journal has always tried to keep this side of Catholicism in balance with the Catholicism that is responsive to democracy and to the religious grounds for believing in religious liberty on principle. But it takes only a slight exposure to the Syllabus and similar documents to cause many Protestants who want to be fair to believe there is a danger to our institutions in electing a Catholic President.

If Catholics would admit that they have given Protestants some grounds for anxiety and if Protestants would admit that Catholic solidarity in the effort to break through finally on the Presidency is natural, we might be able to live with the problem with less bigotry and bitterness.

As we noted above, the absence of distinctive issues in the Wisconsin primary placed religious differences in the spotlight. This is not likely to be the case, however, if Mr. Nixon is nominated, for the issues between the Democrats and the Republicans in the election campaign will be far-reaching. Is there not a good chance that in November, if Senator Kennedy is nominated for either the Presidency or the Vice-Presidency, religion will play a subordinate role when compared with the social issues that will separate the parties?

J. C. B.

The Divine Name

PAUL TILLICH

You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who takes his name in vain. Exodus 20: 7

THERE MUST BE something extraordinary about the divine name if the second commandment tries to protect it as the other commandments try to protect life, honor and property. Of course, God does not need to protect himself, but he does protect his name, so seriously that he adds to this single commandment a special threat. This is done because within the name that which bears the name is present.

In ancient times men believed they had in their power the being whose hidden name they knew. It was believed that the savior-god conquered the demons by finding out the mystery of the power embodied in their names, just as we try today to find out the hidden names of the powers that disrupt our unconscious depths and drive us to mental disturbances. If we gain insight into their hidden striving, we have broken their power.

Men have always tried to use the divine name in the same way, not in order to break its power but to put its power into their own service. Calling the name of God in prayer, for instance, can be an attempt to make God into a tool for our purposes. A name is never an empty sound; it is a bearer of power; it gives Spiritual Presence to the unseen.

This is the reason the divine name can be taken in vain, and why one may destroy oneself by taking it in vain. For the Holy, if called, does not leave us unaffected. If it does not heal us, it may disintegrate us. This is the seriousness of the use of the divine name; this is the danger of religion and even of anti-religion. For in both of them the name of God is being used as well as misused.

I want to deal here with the danger of the use of the word *God* both in its denial and in its affirmation, and of the sublime embarrassment that we feel when we say *God*. We may distinguish three forms of such embarrassment: the embarrassment of tact, the embarrassment of doubt and the embarrassment of awe.

Not long ago, an intellectual leader was reported as saying: "I hope for the day when everyone can speak again of God without embarrassment." These words, seriously meant, deserve thoughtful consideration especially in view of the fact that the last fifteen years have brought to this country an immense increase in willingness to use the name of God—an unquestionable and astonishing revival, if not of religion, then certainly of religious awareness. Do we hope that this will lead us to a state in which the name of God will be used without a sublime embarrassment, without the restriction imposed by the fact that in the divine name there is more present than the name? Is an unembarrassed use of the divine name desirable? Is unembarrassed religion desirable? Certainly not! For the presence of the divine in the name demands a shy and trembling heart.

Everyone at one time or another is in a situation where he must decide whether he shall use or avoid the name of God, whether he shall talk with personal involvement about religious matters, be it for or against them. Making such a decision is often difficult. We feel that we should remain silent in a group of people where it might be tactless to introduce the name of God or even to talk about religion. But our attitude is not unambiguous. We believe we are being tactful when actually we may be cowardly. And then sometimes we accuse ourselves of cowardice although it was really tact that prevented us from speaking out. This happens not only to those who would have spoken out *for* God, but also to those who would have spoken out *against* God. Whether for or against him, his name was on our lips and we were embarrassed because we felt that more was at stake here than social tact. So we kept silent, not certain whether rightly or wrongly. The situation itself was uncertain.

Perhaps we would have become isolated or ridiculous by even mentioning the divine name, whether affirming or denying it. But perhaps there would have been one for whom mentioning the divine name would have produced a first experience of the Spiritual Presence and a decisive moment in his life. And again, perhaps there was someone for whom a tactless mentioning of God meant the

Dr. Tillich is University Professor at Harvard University. His latest book is *Theology of Culture* (Oxford).

definite feeling of repulsion against religion. He may now think that religion *as such* is an abuse of the name *God*.

No one can look into the hearts of even those with whom he speaks intimately. We must risk *now* to talk courageously and *now* to keep silent tactfully. But in no case should we be pushed into a directness of affirming or denying God that is lacking that tact which is born out of awe. The sublime embarrassment about his real presence in and through his name should never leave us.

Many persons have felt the pain of this embarrassment when they had to teach their children the divine name, and others have felt it perhaps when they tried to protect their children against a divine name that they considered an expression of a dangerous superstition. It seems natural to teach children most objects in nature and history without embarrassment, and there are parents who think it is equally natural to teach them divine things.

But I believe there are many of us who as parents in this situation feel a sublime embarrassment. We know as Jesus knew that children are more open to the divine presence than adults. However, it may well be that just this easiness with which we use the divine name may close this openness and make children insensitive to the depth and the mystery of what is present in the divine name.

Yet if we try to withhold it from them, whether because we affirm or because we deny it, emptiness may take hold of their hearts and they may accuse us later, saying that we have cut them off from the most important thing in life. A spirit-inspired tact is necessary in order to find the right way between these dangers. No technical skill or psychological knowledge can replace the sublimely embarrassed mind of parents or teachers, especially teachers of religion.

There is a form of misuse of the name of God that offends those who hear it with a sensitive ear just because it did not worry those who misused it without sensitivity. I am pointing to a public use of the name of God that has little to do with God, but much with human purposes—which may be good or bad ones. Those of us who are grasped by the mystery that is present in the name of God are often deeply hurt if this name is used in governmental and political speeches—as will increasingly happen during the election year in opening prayers for conferences and dinners, in secular and religious advertisements, in international war propaganda, warm or cold. Often the frequent use of the name *God* is praised, as this indicates that we

are a religious nation. And one boasts about this, comparing one's own with other nations.

Should we condemn this? It is hard *not* to do so, but neither is it easy to *do* so. If the divine name is used publicly with full conviction, and therefore with embarrassment and spiritual tact, it may be used without offense; but this is hardly ever so. In most cases it is taken in vain when used for purposes that are not for the glory of his name.

The Embarrassment of Doubt

There is another more basic cause for sublime embarrassment about using the divine name—the doubt about God himself. Such doubt is universally human, and God would not be God if we could possess him like another piece of our encountered world and verify his reality like another reality under inquiry. Without conquered doubt, there is no faith. Faith must overcome something; it must leap over the ordinary processes that provide evidence because its object lies above the realm in which scientific verification is possible. Faith is the courage that conquers doubt, not by removing it, but by taking it as an element into itself.

I am convinced that the element of doubt conquered in faith is never completely lacking in any serious affirmation of God. It is not always on the surface, but it works always in the depth of our being. If you know people intimately who have a seemingly primitive unshaken faith, you can easily discover the underswell of doubt that surges up to the surface in critical moments. If you know religious leaders, you can hear out of their own mouth the story of the struggle that is going on in them between faith and unfaith. If you are able to listen to fanatics of faith, you will hear under their unquestioning affirmations of God a shrill sound coming from their repressed doubt. It is repressed but not annihilated.

If you have listened, on the other side, to the cynical denials of God that are an expression of the flight from a meaning of life, you have heard in them the voice of a carefully covered despair—a despair that shows that there is not assurance but doubt about their negation in the ground of their cynicism. And if you have met those who with assumedly scientific reasons deny God, you find that they are certain about their denials only so long as they fight—and rightly so—against superstitious ideas of God. If, however, they ask the question of God who is really God—namely the

question of the meaning of life as a whole and their own life, including their scientific work—their self-assurance tumbles, for neither the affirmer nor the denier of God can be ultimately certain about his affirmation or his denial.

Doubt, and not certitude, is our human situation, whether we affirm or deny God. And perhaps the difference between them is not so great as one usually thinks. Perhaps they are very similar in their mixture of faith and doubt. Therefore, denial of God, if it is serious, should not bother us. The only thing that should trouble everyone who takes life seriously is the existence of indifference. For he who does not care when hearing the name of God, while feeling at the same time that here the meaning of his life is being asked, defies his true humanity.

It is the doubt in the depth of faith that often produces the sublime embarrassment. Such embarrassment can be an expression of conscious or unconscious honesty. Have you experienced how something in us sometimes makes us stop, perhaps only for one moment, when we want to say *God*? This moment of hesitation can be an expression of a deep feeling for God. It says something about the power of the divine name, and it says something about him who hesitates to use it.

Sometimes we hesitate to use the word *God* even without words, when we are in solitude; we may hesitate to speak to God even privately and voicelessly, as in a prayer. It may be that doubt prevents us from praying. And beyond this we may feel that the gap between God and us makes the use of his name impossible for us; we do not dare to speak to him because we feel him standing against us. This can be a profound affirmation of him. The silent embarrassment of using the divine name can protect us against violating the divine mystery.

The Embarrassment of Awe

We have spoken about the silence of tact and the silence of honesty concerning the divine name. But behind both of them lies something more fundamental, the silence of awe that seems to prohibit the speaking of *God* altogether. Is *this* the last word demanded by the divine mystery? Must we spread silence around us about what concerns us more than anything else—the meaning of our existence? The answer is *no*! For God himself has given mankind names of himself in those moments when he has broken into our finitude and has made himself manifest. We can and, even more, we must

use these names; for silence has power only if it is the other side of speaking and in this way becomes itself a kind of speaking.

This is both our justification and our being judged when we gather together in the name of God. We are an assembly in which we speak about God. We are a church. The church is the place in which the mystery of the Holy should be experienced with awe and sacred embarrassment. But is this so? Are our prayers, communal or personal, more a use or a misuse of the divine name? Do we feel the sublime embarrassment that so many people outside the churches feel? Are we gripped by awe when as ministers we point to the Spiritual Presence in the sacraments, or as theological interpreters of the Holy are we too assured that we can really explain him to others? Is enough sacred embarrassment in us when fluent biblical quotations or quick, mechanized words of prayer pour easily from our mouths? Do we preserve the distance from the Holy-Itself if we claim to have the truth about him, or to be at the place of his presence or to be the administrators of his power: the proprietors of the Christ. How much embarrassment, how much awe is alive in the devotional services Sunday after Sunday all over the world?

And now let me ask the churches and all its members, including you and me, a bold question. Could it be that in order to judge all the misuse of his name within the churches, God reveals himself from time to time by creating silence about himself? Could it be that sometimes he prevents the use of his name in order to protect his name? That he silences a generation about what was natural to previous generations, the use of the word *God*? Could it be that godlessness is not only due to human resistance, but also to God's paradoxical acting, using men and the forces by which they are driven in order to give judgment against the assemblies who gather in his name and take his name in vain? Is the secular silence about God that we experience everywhere in present-day mankind perhaps the way that God forces his church back to a sacred embarrassment about speaking of him?

It may be bold to ask these questions, and no answer can be given because we are not on the inside of the divine providence. But even without an answer, the question itself should be a warning to all those inside the churches for whom the use of his name is too easy.

And now let me close with a few words that are both personal and more than personal. While thinking about this sermon I tried to make of it not only a sermon about the divine name, but also

about God himself. I was thoroughly defeated in this attempt, and I had to learn that no one can give a sermon about God himself.

Such an attempt stands under the judgment of the very commandment that I tried to interpret.

Whither African Nationalism?

THIS IS Africa's year of nationalism as more nation-states come into being than at any time in the continent's history. The unrestrained nationalism that brings these countries into existence will be severely tested, as to the type and stability of self-government. The supreme test, though, is whether African nationalism can keep open the frontiers that the outside forces of colonialism and Christianity cut through the jungle of closed, suspicious tribal communities.

The success or failure of African nationalism depends upon the kind of nationalism that wins out. Will it be a nationalism restrained and internally corrected by a transcendent Christian value system? Or a nationalism that subordinates itself to pan-Africanism so that the benefits of a united nations for Africa will prevail? Or a selfish black nationalism that destroys itself, hating both the malefactors and benefactors of the colonial past and splitting itself upon tribal jealousies?

There are evidences that African nationalism belongs to this latter lowest variety. Some observers think it is fed primarily by anti-white hate. Its fervor and what unity it has are derived from the pent-up feelings of the black man against the exploiters, sometimes specified as "the military, the mercenary and the missionary."

This gives rise to rash statements. The last sentence of Kwame Nkrumah's autobiography reads: "Our task is not done until the last vestiges of colonialism have been swept from Africa." Dr. Hastings K. Banda, currently visiting in this country, seized the leadership of Nyasaland's independence movement and won his place in prison with these words: "Go to your prisons in your millions, singing Hallelujah! The European has had his opportunity to lead Africans, and has lost it. To hell with white rule." A young Nigerian addressed this winter's Ecumenical Student Conference of the National Student Christian Federation in this mood: "By 1970 we will sweep the last vestige of colonial-

ism from the whole continent of Africa. Let racists and fascists quake and fear."

The Accra All-Africa People's Conference set the note: "Civilized or not, ignorant or illiterate, rich or poor, we deserve a government of our own choice." Tom Mboya claims "The Europeans want me to agree that Kenya is different from Ghana. I won't agree. They are fundamentally the same despite the existence of a handful of European settlers. Kenya is an *African* country."

Expressions such as these no doubt strike a responsive chord in all freedom-loving Americans, but even the average citizen who has no more help in political analysis than his weekly *Time* is able to see the pitfalls along this road. Not all the younger nationalists are as generous as the Union of South Africa's Chief Luthuli, who told me this past October, even though he was at the moment under ban (equivalent to house arrest) for his own leadership in the African Nationalist Congress, that "I am willing for any person to stay here who calls himself an African."

Pan-Africanism: a Positive Force

Pan-Africanism is the positive force that seeks to convert the negative expression of nationalism. The two most nationalistic leaders of Africa have embraced it, indeed are vying with each other to command it. Nkrumah recounts how in the hour of his Ghana triumph he "drove home, physically and mentally tired but indescribably happy and content. . . . From now on it must be pan-African nationalism, and the ideology of African political consciousness and African political emancipation must spread throughout the whole continent, into every nook and corner of it. I have never regarded the struggle for the independence of the Gold Coast as an isolated objective but always as a part of a general world historical pattern."

Pan-Africanism: a Positive Force

Nasser in an early paper setting forth his ideals for Egypt wrote similarly: "We cannot under any circumstance remain aloof from the terrible and sanguinary struggle going on in Africa today be-

Mr. Bryan is a member of the Department of Religion at Wake Forest College in North Carolina. He recently returned from an extended tour of Africa.

tween five million whites and 200 million Africans. . . . I will continue to dream of the day when I will find in Cairo a great African Institute dedicated . . . to an enlightened African consciousness and to sharing with others from all over the world in the work of advancing the peoples of the continent." His dream is expressed at the moment in the powerful radio station beaming its propaganda in twenty-five languages over Africa.

President Tubman of Liberia and the prime ministers of the three regions of Nigeria have all declared themselves for pan-Africanism. Even the historic "Lion" of Ethiopia, traditionally a go-it-aloner, has caught the mood and surprised the Accra Conference with his offer of fifty full-coverage scholarships to his new university for students from any African territory.

Everybody admits the road to a United States of Africa is rough, perhaps impossible. Already it has hit some rough places. Guinea and Ghana are nowhere near working agreements. Nigeria, as it becomes free this year, is not likely to listen to little Ghana, because in traditions, size and diversity it has its own ideas. Even so, the dream of a working unity for Africa, born from an internal affinity rather than superimposed by world powers from the outside, is welcomed by the democratic world.

Now we come to the key question: What relation do these developments within African nationalism have to Western nationalism and the prophetic caution of Christianity? Here in the West we hear a lot of criticism from both Christians and non-Christians about the turn of African nationalism. To say the least, this criticism is ill-taken by Africans.

They cannot understand how the defenders of "White Western Christian Civilization" are mostly against the African's struggle toward nationalism when this same civilization has given the world the worst example of unrestrained nationalism. They cannot understand how its defenders are against the African's use of force when Western civilization has given the world the worst example of organized violence. They cannot understand how its defenders are against the African's rising birth rate, when the surplus population of Western civilization has overflowed into the world's colonies under the theory of *Lebensraum*.

In the light of these easily seen contradictions, it is little wonder that Africans are demanding the right to their own brand of nationalism. What confuses the African more than anything else, though, is that the most violent, unrestrained form

of nationalism in Africa, perhaps in the world, issues from the one nation on the continent that is loudly proclaiming the preservation of "White Western Christian Civilization." If South African nationalism is Western, indeed Christian, then the African nations have a poor model to imitate.

This situation ought to cause Westerners to be more reserved in criticism and more patient at the stumbling of the younger African nations. Too often we consider it our duty to warn non-Europeans of the dangers of nationalism, and we are irritated by what we may consider unreasonable outbursts of exaggerated nationalism. However, as I was told by more than one African politician, we are obliged to be patient during this transitional era of nationalist mania. As someone has suggested, the current devices—personality cults, flamboyant oratory and campaigning, intolerance toward minorities and dissident groups, vigorous promotion of public works and development schemes, as in Cuba for instance—may be natural to young states seeking to deepen their people's patriotism.

Understanding African Nationalism

After all, we must remember that African nationalism is more likely to be up against bickering tribalism and narrow localism than competing nation-states. Its principal task is to formulate new centers of loyalty, more universal, more elevated. Its positive assignment is to mold the hundreds of small tribes into a viable politico-economic unit, on a footing with other nation-states of the world. This means that Africa must learn overnight new loyalties toward the nation-states now emerging.

A World Council of Churches' working paper aptly summarizes the present movement in Africa:

The "nationhood" concept is not a simple echo of European influences, not a mere reaction to European rule, or a belated effort to repeat what Europe did in the past, but much more often a responsible attempt to develop human potentialities in a common effort. . . . It is often based less on the desire for mere prestige and more on economic urgency, and may therefore claim more justification. It often springs also from the people's desire to reform their own reactionary governments. It is, in that sense, more humane and human than some European nationalism.

We will have more sympathy if we acknowledge that the major bent of African nationalism is against the petty, shortsighted, often corrupt tribalism that would destroy altogether the concept of

larger politico-economic freedom just now so dearly won from outside powers. An American specialist in West Africa, a careful longtime observer of African affairs, informed me that this may take years of "toddling democracy which may never learn to walk steadily."

More sympathy on our part admittedly will not cure Africans of their respectable pretensions in the arena of world power or of their base pretensions with regard to national freedom. With regard to the former, the new African states are not oblivious to the power struggle in the world of nations where their voice in the UN, their possession of atomic weapons, and their assertion of economic competition may change the course of history. With regard to the latter, Africans may be as guilty as Asians in making of independence an absolute, final good. This was Reinhold Niebuhr's rejoinder to Gandhi's pure motivation theory.

Three Things to Recognize

If Africans tend to take the Christian ideal of equality and freedom too literally they stand in the tradition of St. Augustine who claimed that no nation has a right to rule over another nation. It is in this vein that Rena Karefa-Smart of Sierra Leone in an article entitled "Africa Asks Questions of the West" (*The Ecumenical Review*, Oct. 1957, p. 53) chides: "If there is neither Jew nor Greek in God's presence, then the colonial ruler has no more right to rule the colonial than the colonial has to rule him..."

Besides having understanding and patience with Africa's wandering toward her own form of nationalism, Westerners can surely recognize and acknowledge three other things. First, the spirit of pan-Africanism as a legitimate ingredient of the universalism in the Gospel. Surely it is "kissing cousin" to Tennyson's Parliament of Man and the Social Gospel's Brotherhood of the Kingdom. The fact is that this stage of nationalism with its futuristic mood has much in common with the uncritical Social Gospel.

In this context it does not seem strange that Dr. Azikwe ended his major bid for the premiership of the new Nigeria with this song (I will let his speech introduce it): "When I attended the Tinubu Methodist Sunday School in Lagos, I was taught to sing a song entitled 'The Golden Age,' which was composed by Walter Hawkins, and its words are so pregnant with wisdom that they have left an

indelible impression on my mind since I left the Sunday School forty years ago."

*It is stage by stage to the golden age
Far off we seem to view it;
But the good we crave will come to the brave
Who see God's will and do it.*

"Zik" went on to say: "All that we had fought for in the drama that is coming to its climax is to enable our children to share and to enjoy a more abundant life than we did; otherwise, the struggle would be worthless." Social Gospel fancifulness, yes, but history suggests that Wesleyan singing saved England from a French Revolution.

Second, realistic democracy can impose the necessary restraints upon the uncritical, totalitarian nationalism whether of dictator Nasser, or the one-party democracy of Nkrumah, or the Christian Nationalism of the South African government. Against the fanaticism of the Mau Mau nationalists of Kenya, the African church has already produced more martyrs than the United States has in its entire history.

On December 3, 1959, just a few days before their freedom elections, I read a full-page article in the leading newspaper of Nigeria entitled, "We Must Not Expect Perfection in our Politicians." The pseudonym *Edilog* could not hide the line upon line, precept upon precept argument that some Nigerian had studied under Reinhold Niebuhr! He wrote: "I will summarize under four headings: (1) Healthy balance between optimism and pessimism. (2) Self-interest versus the general or common interest. (3) Absolute satisfaction of political ideals is not a historical possibility. (4) Absolute equality is not a practical possibility." Under point three he added:

In Nigeria today we expect too much from politics. . . . All political achievements no matter by whatever political party are always limited, fragmentary and incomplete. Quack political leaders who promise the sky will be recognized as the liars that they are. . . . We examine the claims and the counterclaims of all our political parties with balanced and unaffected objectivity. The end of colonialism in Nigeria is not going to be the end of social injustice because to expect the age of plenty and the absence of coercion in Nigeria or any other country is to expect the impossible.

Such an article in the very journal of the Nigerian politician previously quoted is enough to bring the Social Gospel flightiness of African nationalism back to earth!

Thirdly, the Christian Church in Africa can provide a forum for airing political issues and a training ground for responsible political vocations among the citizens. Too often in the past under colonialism the mission churches steered clear of any involvement, often to such an extent as to seem to discourage any of their membership who became engaged in "revolutionary" activity. All this must change. There are signs that the change is already afoot.

One of the most relevant political documents produced by any church body in the world is the recent working paper of suggestions for Kenya's Constitutional Committee produced by the Christian Council of that country. It gives signs of long deliberations, urgency and relevance to all the issues facing the birth-passage of a nation from colonialism to freedom.

Every gathering of the ecumenical church in Africa demands more political responsibility on the part of Christians. If the church in the world at large took as much realistic interest in and produced as much individual participation in politics as the church of Africa does, we could expect not only sympathetic understanding but also some correction of Western nationalism, and more reaching across oceans to assist brothers coming into their birthright.

CORRESPONDENCE

Ambiguities Within Atomic Matter

TO THE EDITORS: In his review of Dr. Niebuhr's new book (Feb. 8 issue), Hans Morgenthau reminds us of the paradox that whereas man is prodigiously successful in comprehending the world of nature, in the social realm the questions of what is real and what illusory, what is permanent and what transitory, have not been answered. Perhaps the historical process never will be exposed by rational inquiry, simply because the inquiring self is not so rational that it can purge its interpretation of distortions that inevitably arise from the self's involvement in history.

But Mr. Morgenthau overdramatizes, I think, the paradox of man as observer of nature vs. man as observer of himself, not making history too unintelligible but seeing science as too reasonable. In speaking of the physical universe which "...man can understand with an adequacy that points to the common source of both" the stars and the atoms, he is thinking of the age following Newton that conceived of the universe as a giant machine in which immediate happenings would reveal their "efficient causes," and the totality of happenings an ultimate principle. Mr. Morgenthau's identification

of "the cognitive qualities of the human mind" with the laws of the universe is both Thomistic, in the sense of individual reason as essentially a part of universal reason, and post-Newtonian, to the extent that the "final cause" of the giant machine is seen as rationally apprehensible.

If we now see (as Augustine saw long before) that Aquinas demanded inhumanly of human reason, we also recognize that Newton and his progenitors anticipated a coherence in physical nature that 20th century physics has not confirmed. Atomic research has revealed that particles of matter (atoms and subatomic elements) behave in ways understandable only in terms of laws at once complementary and incompatible; instead of unitary Principle, a multitude of discontinuous principles only one of which applies to a particular atomic experience but all of which are required to understand the full range of atomic occurrences.

Robert Oppenheimer speaks of this arsenal of unrelated explanations for atomic behavior as "antinomic modes," extending the concept beyond the domain of science as a way of comprehending man existentially. It is ironic indeed that the paradoxes of man in history which perennially defy a rationally inclusive explanation should find a parallel in what appear to be essential ambiguities within atomic matter.

ROBERT H. GILCHRIST
New Milford, Conn.

A Roman Catholic in the White House?

TO THE EDITORS: Hurrah for John Bennett's editorial, "A Roman Catholic for President?" in the March 7 issue. It has helped clear the air over an issue that is becoming increasingly confused. Unfortunately, most of the Protestant objections to a Catholic President (priority of loyalties, church-state relations, etc.) boil down to a simple denial of the Presidential office to a Catholic.

And I don't think articles like the one in *Life* by Bishop Pike (Dec. 21, 1959) help very much. That particular article certainly left the impression that, at best, it would be a real gamble to support a Catholic for President. This is just not the case, and I hope this Protestant hesitancy will not become just plain bigotry at the grass roots. For it will be a real affront, as Dr. Bennett suggests, to 35,000,000 of our fellow citizens if the American people deny the Presidential office to a Catholic.

JAMES R. BLANNING
Cambridge, Mass.

"No Longer a Protestant Country"?

TO THE EDITORS: It is good for the readers of *Christianity and Crisis* and *The New York Times* (in which an account of Dr. Bennett's editorial appeared) to know that all Protestants do not have completely closed minds on the question of having a Roman Catholic President in the White House,
(Continued on page 64.)

The Student Non-Violent Movement for Racial Equality

HERLUF M. JENSEN

BY THIS TIME it is quite obvious that the non-violent movement of students toward racial equality has become a serious problem for the white South. That problems are also posed for those involved in the movement has become increasingly clear to some of us who have been travelling in the South and who were observers at the leadership conference held over Easter week-end at Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina.

The spontaneous character of the movement is one of these problems. In place after place, students simply jumped into various things—sit-ins, mass demonstrations, marches, poster walking, prayer vigils, etc.—without either having prepared themselves adequately or having thought through the implications of what they were doing. Contrary to Harry Truman and many state officials in the South, it is my distinct impression that there were no outside agitators and perhaps less than a handful who had even a clear idea of what to do.

Spontaneity has, of course, been one of the strengths of the movement. However, at Shaw University the recognition that a movement cannot long exist on spontaneity and enthusiasm alone led to the establishment of a "temporary coordinating committee" to work out some of the major problems and issues now faced in trying to sustain the movement and make it into a significant and continuing force.

Many organizations and individuals have sought to take credit for developing the movement and to gain public relations mileage. The well-known cautiousness of the contemporary student generation, however, has helped to insure that representatives of virtually all these organizations have been viewed with suspicion. In spite of press reports, based no doubt on personal interviews with the self-heralded leaders, very few of them are in fact accepted as such and some are explicitly rejected by the students.

A second major problem revolves around what non-violence is. Many students quickly committed themselves to non-violence without knowing much about the method, and in some cases knowing virtually nothing of what Martin Luther King and James Lawson at Shaw University repeatedly referred to as the spirit of non-violence. King and Lawson are deeply concerned to make a breakthrough at the moral level—the level of human relations and reconciliation between the races—and not simply at the level of legal victories.

Mr. Jensen is General Secretary of the National Student Christian Federation. Extensive travelling, close contact and acute observation undergird his report.

Accordingly they have insisted that the local and regional organization of the movement, the question of jail versus bail, the method of making decisions (e.g. by patient arrival at group consensus rather than by parliamentary or dictatorial procedure), the need for careful involvement of Negro and white, the problem of broadening the base to include other than college students, and the resolution of several other issues, should emerge from an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of non-violence. This has already proven very difficult for students and others to understand or accept.

As Mr. King said: "It must be made palpably clear that resistance and non-violence are not in themselves good. There is another element that must be present in our struggle that then makes our resistance and non-violence truly meaningful. That element is reconciliation. Our ultimate end must be the creation of the beloved community. The tactics of non-violence without the spirit may indeed become a kind of violence."

These major questions may ultimately determine whether the movement will be a positive, significant force in the current world-wide struggle to achieve freedom and respect for the oppressed races. There are, however, other significant problems.

Students, and perhaps more desperately, faculty of Negro institutions face the anxious question of what educational and vocational price they are prepared to pay. Some faculty and administrators, perhaps many, may be either spiritually or vocationally (i.e. economically) destroyed by the decisions they make. If they support the students they face loss of hard-to-come-by teaching positions; if they oppose the movement they not only run the risk of cutting themselves off from their deepest communal roots but also of violating disastrously their own consciences.

Someone once said revolutions are born of hope and not despair. If this is true, then I am certain we shall hear much of the student non-violent movement for racial equality. Everywhere I have been, a buoyancy of hope, made stronger by the adversities suffered, is the dominant characteristic of the student non-violent movement.

Now, as seldom before, the question is raised of what real meaning there is to being part of the church, which is so tragically divided itself on this issue that it seems hardly able to sustain its members.



Saint Hereticus

A Revised Hymnary

I'm working on a new hymnal. I'm going to keep the old tunes (grand old tunes, all of them) and simply supply new words for people who feel uncomfortable or hypocritical singing the old words. The words in my hymnal will reflect what people are actually thinking about when they raise their voices in song of a Sunday. This seems to me on the whole much less blasphemous than to sing words one really doesn't believe.

The following, then, are at least descriptively true. We won't go into any detailed defense of their literary merit.

Backwards, Christian Soldiers!

*Like a fleeing army
Moves the Church of God;
Brother treads on brother,
Grinds him in the sod.
We are not united,
Lots of bodies we:
One claims faith, another hope,
A third claims chairity.*

Chorus:

*Backward, Christian soldiers,
Waging fruitless wars,
Breaking out in schism
That our God deplures.*

Some of the hymns need to have alternate versions to be sung depending upon local circumstances.

Faith of Our Fathers, Wholly Faith

Liberal version:

*Faith of our fathers, once so great,
We must revise, or be out of date,
We must distinguish kerygma from myth,
Or they won't be worth bothering with.*

Chorus:

*Faith of our fathers we accept
(Save for the parts that we reject).*

Orthodox version:

*Faith of our fathers, keep it intact!
They wrote it down precisely exact.
Change no expression, no phrases delete,
Their propositions cannot be beat.*

Chorus:

*Faith of our fathers, keep it pure,
Relevance is a sinful lure.*

American version:

*Faith of our founding fathers! We
Now can express with clarity:
"God's on our side, he'll hear every plea
If we'll expand our economy."*

Chorus:

*Faith of our founding fathers! There
Is nothing quite like laissez faire.*

And surely there should be a hymn showing where we place our trust in these dark days.

When Missiles Gild the Skies

*When missiles gild the skies
My heart awakening cries:
"May atom bombs be praised!"
Alight from here to there!
Make enemies despair!
"May atom bombs be praised!"*

*Our plan was all rehearsed
(Except they dropped one first)
"May atom bombs be praised!"
When military facts
Suggested sneak attacks,
Then atom bombs were praised.*

(a short pause, after which the final verse should be sung fortissimo)

*Sing now, eternal choir,
In uncelestial fire,
"May atom bombs be praised!"
They ended human war,
And man forever more,
"May atom bombs be praised!"*

And then there should be a quiet hymn for even-tide, phrased in a mood of penitence.

Tell Us, Canon...

*O God, I'm really not a cad,
The things I do are not so bad,
My actions on the whole are right,
All praise to Thee, my God, this night.*

*My tiny sins thou canst pass by,
The spiteful word, the little lie,
And then I can give thanks aright,
For all the blessings of the light.*

*My peccadillos are so few
Compared to what my neighbors do.
From their misdeeds (such frightful things!)
Keep me, O keep me, King of kings.*

*And since they much more need thine aid
Than I, thy servant undismayed,
Please concentrate on bigger things
Beneath thine own almighty wings.*

Correspondence (Continued from page 61.)

nor have we all made up our minds on this issue before any candidate has been nominated. The views of Dr. Bennett and Robert McAfee Brown ("Rules for the Dialogue," *The Christian Century*, Feb. 17 and *The Commonweal*, Feb. 19) are being read with widespread approval in our land and we are grateful for their broadmindedness and their objectiveness of spirit. In them we see present day Protestantism at its best in an election year.

However, I do take exception to some of Dr. Bennett's statements. I vigorously reject his stating as a fact "that this is no longer a Protestant country." While ours has been a pluralistic society religiously, to a small degree in its earliest days and now greater than ever before, yet it has always been and still is predominantly Protestant. . . . In spite of the predominance of Catholics in our large cities and on our northeastern seaboard, it is still true that two out of every three Americans are Protestant or non-Catholic.

Furthermore, our national government was established and still functions very much upon Protestant principles, ideas and ideals—representative government, separation of church and state, freedom of worship, assembly and expression. In view of this and many other instances of our Protestant way of looking at life and liberty, is it not untrue to state that we are no longer a Protestant country?

We cannot help but note that when Senator Kennedy was asked by *Look* (March 3, 1959) to answer several important questions on such issues as separation of church and state, Federal aid to parochial schools, ambassador to the Vatican, birth control, etc., his answers were those of a highly intelligent and devoted Catholic who has become very much "Protestantized" in his ideas and attitudes.

Had Senator Kennedy been born and . . . educated in Spain, his answers to those questions would have been quite different! It is because he lived his life in a country that is Protestant that he has these ideas that are so natural to all Protestants and non-Catholics. No wonder the hierarchy was so critical of him expressing such Protestant ideas!

J. HAROLD THOMPSON
Little Falls, N.Y.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRY
PHILOSOPHY-REL-EDU-PER
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
1714 11-608 A

Mr. Thompson's letter leads me to draw a distinction between our country's having an ethos that is primarily Protestant, certainly more Protestant than Catholic, and the possibility of assuming that Protestantism has a kind of unofficial privilege over other faiths. For example, we cannot solve the problem of religion and public education by taking for granted a Protestant consensus with only marginal objection to it, or by using Protestant symbols and teaching a kind of non-denominational Protestant doctrine. It also means that we should not be offended if a President were seen every Sunday shaking hands with Catholic dignitaries rather than Dr. Elson. I am sure Mr. Thompson would agree to this, and I do not deny the main point about the Protestant ethos.

However, it seems to me that Mr. Thompson greatly exaggerates the Protestant character of our political institutions. Separation of church and state, for instance, is not a Protestant principle; it is an American principle and it is a Baptist principle. Church and state are united in many Protestant countries today and have been so even more in the past. Protestantism has no monopoly on representative government, though it has flourished most in nations that have much Protestantism in their traditions.

I think that what Mr. Thompson says about Senator Kennedy is right; on matters of public policy, he will be more responsive to Harvard University than to the College of Cardinals.

J. C. B.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N.Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
ALEXANDER MILLER J. B. DUROSELLE
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY SIDNEY LANIER
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD PAUL H. NITZE

CONTENTS

THE DIVINE NAME PAUL TILLICH
WHITHER AFRICAN NATIONALISM? MCLEOD BRYAN
THE STUDENT NON-VIOLENT MOVEMENT
FOR RACIAL EQUALITY HERLUF M. JENSEN
A REVISED HYMNARY ST. HERETICUS